

ISSP study monitoring 2007: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP

Scholz, Evi; Heller, Marleen

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Verzeichnis, Liste, Dokumentation / list

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Scholz, E., & Heller, M. (2009). *ISSP study monitoring 2007: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP*. (GESIS-Technical Reports, 2009/05). Mannheim: GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-207025>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

ISSP Study Monitoring 2007

Evi Scholz and Marleen Heller

GESIS-Technical Reports 2009|05

ISSP Study Monitoring 2007

Report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring
work undertaken for the ISSP

Evi Scholz and Marleen Heller

GESIS-Technical Reports

GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Postfach 12 21 55

68072 Mannheim

Telefon: (0621) 1246 – 283

Telefax: (0621) 1246 – 100

E-Mail: evi.scholz@gesis.org

ISSN: 1868-9043 (Print)

ISSN: 1868-9051 (Online)

Herausgeber,

Druck und Vertrieb: GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften
Lennéstraße 30, 53113 Bonn

Contents

Introduction.....	7
Summary of the findings	9
Language(s) and translation.....	9
Survey question coverage and context	9
Sampling.....	10
Data collection.....	10
Information on response and outcome figures	11
Data	12
Documentation.....	12
References	12
Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2007	14
Monitoring Findings Chart	20
Appendix	57
Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures.....	59
ISSP Study Monitoring Questionnaires for Face-to-Face and Mail Surveys.....	60

Introduction

Standards of “best practices for survey and public opinion research” such as published by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) call for quality checks at each stage of the survey process lifecycle. Defining standards and establishing benchmarks for good or best practices is an important step towards enabling quality to be assessed. A similarly critical step involves defining the criteria by which one or the other category or standard is to be defined. The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) guidelines on best practices and its definitions of nonresponse (The American Association for Public Opinion Research 2006) are good examples of such guidelines and definitions. Without documentation, however, quality assessment is impossible and quality improvement unlikely (Harkness 1999, Mohler and Uher 2003). Reporting outcomes is also a useful way of encouraging improvement in procedures (Lynn 2001). In numerous instances, the ISSP Study Monitoring documentation has resulted in improved standards in the ISSP.

Study monitoring involves collecting information on study design and every stage of implementation, requiring researchers to disclose their procedures and outcomes. If conducted while a study is happening, monitoring is the key to intervention which can reduce survey error. It is critical in controlling the quality of procedures and outcomes and plays an important role in helping projects improve design and implementation. Timely and ongoing lifecycle process monitoring is an important tool to reduce survey error during the relevant stage of implementation, whether this be design, data collection or data editing. However, as Mohler, Pennell and Hubbard (2008) note; “Standards in survey documentation have evolved in parallel with the technological and methodological developments in survey research. In just a few decades, paper documents describing the contents of rectangular data files (i.e., codebooks) have been replaced with on-line access to documents that both describe and facilitate analysis of complex hierarchical and/or relational databases. Despite these advances, examples of complete or even adequate survey documentation remain surprisingly rare.”

Cross-national study monitoring as pioneered in the ISSP represents a special case of survey documentation and study monitoring. ISSP Study Monitoring and Study Monitoring Reports as carried out by GESIS is monitoring *after the event*. The aim of ISSP monitoring and reports is at least twofold. From the beginning (cf. Park and Jowell 1997), one goal was to monitor and record for internal ISSP purposes how ISSP studies were conducted in each country and how implementations met or failed to meet ISSP requirements as defined by the ISSP Working Principles. These aims are related to the pursuit of basic good or best practices in ISSP studies but also to comparability of data across ISSP datasets. Data quality in cross-

national studies is not only a matter of quality procedures but also of comparability across data sets and across the procedures resulting in these data sets (Harkness 1999, Mohler and Uher 2003, Scholz and Klein 2003). Comparability in this context operates on many levels (cf. Lyberg et al. 1997, Lynn et al. 2006, Harkness 2008).

For users of ISSP data, the Study Monitoring Reports bring together information of relevance for analysis not otherwise available in such compact form. The documentation provided on major aspects of each member's fielding and outcomes goes a considerable way towards guiding researchers on which differences between ISSP countries they might ignore and which they should consider. We note that the study documentation available for the European Social Survey, supported by EU funding and introduced in a different historical context, has benefited from but also goes beyond the documentation provided by the ISSP.

The ISSP is a collaborative survey programme with members from all over the world with an annual module on a topic important for social science research. The programme started 25 years ago with four General Social Surveys as founding members and counts 46 member countries in 2009. Figure 1 lists the current ISSP members and illustrates which different cultural contexts ISSP covers nowadays.



Figure 1: ISSP Member Countries 2009

The following report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by GESIS for the ISSP on the 2007 Leisure Times and Sports module.

Data from thirty-four member countries have been archived for the 2007 Leisure Time and Sports module; all of these member countries have completed the monitoring questionnaire. Details of the individual answers members provided are presented in the summary chart which follows here. We have done our best to summarise the answers we received and to check the information with members. Members were given the opportunity to make corrections before the report is made available on the Archive web site as a supplement to the 2007 codebook.

Summary of the findings

Language(s) and translation

(see pages 21–29 of the Findings Chart)

From 1999 on, the study monitoring questionnaire (SMQ) asks whether members checked or evaluated their translations. All of the twenty-nine countries that produced translations checked or evaluated them. Fourteen countries did not pre-test the translated questionnaire¹ (Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, France, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Russia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden, Uruguay). South Africa fielded in seven languages, the Philippines in five languages, Switzerland and Israel in three languages and Finland, Latvia, the Slovak Republic and the USA in two languages. All the other member countries fielded in one language.

Some countries reported translation problems (Finland, Germany and Sweden).

Survey question coverage and context

(see pages 30–32 of the Findings Chart)

Seven Countries (Austria, Argentina, Australia, Flanders, Hungary, Taiwan and the USA) omitted background variables, usually by mistake.

In 2007, twenty-five countries fielded the ISSP module as part of a larger survey. A question in the SMQ asking for information about studies (topic, study title, etc.) the ISSP was fielded with is included in the report (see appendix).

¹ The Philippines did a pre-test for Filipino but not for the other four languages the survey was fielded in. Switzerland did a pre-test for the German and French version but not for the Italian. South Africa did a pre-test for Afrikaans but not for the other six languages the survey was fielded in. The USA did a pre-test for the Spanish translation

Sampling

(see pages 33–39 of the Findings Chart)

The sampling procedures and details reported for the 2007 module are for the most part similar to those reported in earlier years. None of the countries seem to be using quota procedures at the stage of respondents' selection. Six reported using substitution of different kinds: Argentina, Chile, Cyprus, Germany, Russia and the Slovak Republic.

Finland had a lower age cut-off at 15 years, Japan, Russia and South Africa had a cut-off at 16 years; Uruguay had a cut-off at 17 years; Norway had a age cut-off at 19 years; all other members had a lower age cut-off at 18 years of age. Six countries reported an upper age cut-off (Finland and Latvia at 74, Czech Republic and Sweden at 79, Norway at 80, Flandern at 85).

Data collection

(see pages 40-48 of the Findings Chart)

MODES

Essentially the ISSP questionnaires are administered as face-to-face interviews or in a self-completion format. Three countries combined several modes in fielding, usually as a result of fielding the ISSP module together with another study and administering the background variables for both studies face-to-face and the ISSP as self-completion (Flanders, Germany, Great Britain).

Four countries using an interviewer-administered mode had two advance contacts, letter and telephone call (Switzerland, Flanders, Taiwan, and the USA). Six countries had advance letters (Czech Republic, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, Poland, and Slovenia); Three countries had a telephone pre-contact (Austria, the Dominican Republic and South Korea). Six countries conducted their survey by mail (see table on page 47-48). Of these, Australia, Finland, Norway and Sweden had four or more, New Zealand had three and France had two mailings. The number of mailings is usually seen as relevant for enhancing response (Dillman 2000). Sweden had a telephone reminder. In the USA, about 19% of the interviews were collected by telephone; the mode variable identifies these. Telephone interviews are not permitted in the ISSP.

INCENTIVES

Twelve countries reported they had used incentives (Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, South Korea, Switzerland, Taiwan, and the USA): two countries had used incentives to both respondents and interviewers (Japan and South Korea), four countries incentives to interviewers (the

Czech Republic, the Dominican Republic the Slovak Republic and Slovenia) and six countries have given incentives to respondents (Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Switzerland, Taiwan, and the USA). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

FIELDING DATES

Dates of fielding for the 2007 module range from 2006 to 2008:

2006	2 countries
2007	21 countries
2007-2008	2 country
2008	9 countries

The Philippines had the shortest fielding period, with four days, Argentina had the longest, with almost nine months.

In all countries using interviewer-administered modes, interviewers approached addresses or households at different times of day and at different days of the week.

Countries differ considerably in the number of required contact attempts. The minimum required number of calls at an address or a household ranges from none (Cyprus, Hungary and Russia) to 10 (USA). Ten countries supervised interviews (proportions ranging between 1%-60%). All countries, except Japan, using interviewer-administered modes back-checked interviews (proportions ranging between 5%-100%).

Information on response and outcome figures

(see pages 49-50 of the Findings Chart)

Quota procedures, substitution, and, in some cases, a lack of sufficient detail are the three main obstacles to calculating response rates for some of the ISSP 2007 studies (cf. reasons mentioned in the Park and Jowell report (1997) and expanded in the overview of the 1996-1998 monitoring studies, Harkness, Langfeldt, and Scholz, 2001). Members also differ in their definitions of outcome codes – of what counts as “eligible“, “ineligible“, or “partially completed interviews“, and so forth.

The raw figures for eligible samples and final outcomes indicate, nevertheless, that the range in the ISSP is considerable – from about 20% to over 90% for the module.

Data

(see pages 51-54 of the Findings Chart)

The great majority of members employed various measures of coding reliability, for the most part logic or consistency checks and range checks, followed by either individual or automatic corrections or both.

Twenty of thirty-four countries applied subsequent weights or post-stratification to correct for errors of selection or response bias.

Documentation

(see page 55 of the Findings Chart)

Twenty countries reported they had a national methods report available (Austria, Australia, Bulgaria, Chile, Germany, Dominican Republic, Flanders, Great Britain, Hungary, Norway, the Philippines, Russia, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, South Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Uruguay and the USA). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

References

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (2006): *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys*. 4th edition. Lenexa, Kansas: AAPOR. (available online http://www.aapor.org/uploads/standarddefs_4.pdf)

American Association for Public Opinion Research (2008): Best Practices for Survey and Public Opinion Research. (available online <http://www.aapor.org/bestpractices>)

Dillman, D. A. (2000): Mail and Internet Surveys. The Tailored Design Method. 2. Edition. New York: Wiley.

Harkness, J. (2008) "Comparative Survey Research: Goals and Challenges." Foundation chapter" in De Leeuw, E., Hox., J. and Dillman, D. (eds.) *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*, Hyattsville, VA: Erlbaum.

Harkness, J. (1999): In Pursuit of Quality: Issues for Cross-national Survey Research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 2: 125-140.

Harkness, J., Langfeldt, B. and Scholz, E. (2001): ISSP Study Monitoring 1996-1998, Reports to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany, Mai 2001. (available online with the 1996-1998 codebooks)

Lyberg, L., Biemer, P. P., Collins, M., De Leeuw, E. D., Dippo, C., Schwarz, N., Trewin, D. (1997): *Survey Measurement and Process Quality*. New York: Wiley.

Lynn, P., Japac, L., and Lyberg, L. (2006): What's So Special About Cross-National Surveys? In J. A. Harkness (ed.) *Conducting Cross-National and Cross-Cultural Surveys. Papers from the 2005 Meeting of the International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI)*. Mannheim: ZUMA-Nachrichten Spezial, 12: 7-20.

Lynn, P. (2001): *Developing Quality Standards for Cross-National Survey Research: Five Approaches*, Working Papers of the Institute for Social and Economic Research, paper 2001-21. Colchester: University of Essex.

Mohler, P. Ph., B.-E. Pennell, and Hubbard, F. (2008): "Survey Documentation: Towards Professional Knowledge Management in Sample Surveys" in De Leeuw, E., Hox, J. and Dillman, D. (eds.) *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*, Hyattsville, VA: Erlbaum.

Mohler, P. Ph. and Uher, R. (2003): *Documenting Comparative Surveys for Secondary Analysis*, in J. A. Harkness, F. J. R. Van de Vijver, and P. Ph. Mohler (ed.) *Cross-Cultural Survey Methods*, New York: Wiley.

Park, A. and Jowell, R. (1997): Consistencies and differences in a cross-national survey. The International Social Survey Programme (1995). (available online with the 1995 codebook)

Scholz, E. and Klein, S. (2003): Study Monitoring in the ISSP, ZUMA-Nachrichten, 52: 139-152.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2007

(based on GESIS documentation, July, 2009: Australia to Croatia)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report		
Argentina (2008)	2007	✓	✓		
		Australia (1984)	1996	✓	No
			1997	No	
			1998	✓	✓
			1999	✓	✓
			2000	No	
			2001	✓	✓
			2002	✓	✓
			2003	✓	✓
			2004	✓	✓
			2005	✓	✓
			2006	✓	✓
2007	✓		✓		
Austria (1985)	1996	No			
	1997	✓	No		
	1998	✓	✓		
	1999	✓	✓		
	2000	✓	✓		
	2001	✓	✓		
	2002	✓	✓		
	2003	✓	✓		
	2004	✓	✓		
	2005	No			
	2006	No			
	2007	✓	✓		
Bangladesh (1997) - (2003)	1997	✓	No		
	1998	No			
	1999	No			
	2000	(TP)	No		
	2001	No			
2002	No				
Brazil (1999) - (2006)	1998	(TP)	(✓)		
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		
	2000	No			
	2001	✓	✓		
	2002	✓	✓		
	2003	No			
	2004	✓	✓		
	2005	No			
2006	No				

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	
Bulgaria (1991)	1996	✓	✓	
	1997	✓	✓	
	1998	✓	✓	
	1999	✓	✓	
	2000	✓	✓	
	2001	No		
	2002	✓	✓	
	2003	✓	✓	
	2004	✓	✓	
	2005	✓	✓	
	2006	No		
	2007	✓	✓	
Canada (1991)	1996	✓	✓	
	1997	✓	✓	
	1998	✓	✓	
	1999	✓	✓	
	2000	✓	✓	
	2001	✓	✓	
	2002	No		
	2003	✓	✓	
	2004	✓	✓	
	2005	✓	✓	
	2006	✓	✓	
	2007	No		
	Chile (1997)	1997	No	
		1998	✓	✓
1999		✓	✓	
2000		✓	✓	
2001		✓	✓	
2002		✓	✓	
2003		✓	✓	
2004		✓	✓	
2005		No		
2006		✓	✓	
2007		✓	✓	
China (2007)		2007	No	
Croatia (2005)	2005	No		
	2006	✓	✓	
	2007	✓	✓	

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2007

(based on GESIS documentation, July, 2009: Cyprus to France)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Cyprus (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	No
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	No	
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓
	2006	No	
	2007	✓	✓
Czech Republic (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓
Denmark (1998)	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓
	2007	(TP)	No
The Dominican Republic (2006)	2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Estonia (2008)	2007	No	
Finland (2000)	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓
Flanders (2000)	2000	No	
	2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	No	
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓
	2006	(TP)	No
	2007	✓	✓
France (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2007

(based on GESIS documentation, July, 2009: Germany to Japan)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Germany (1984)	1996	✓	✓	Ireland (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	(TP)	(✓)
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓		2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓		2007	✓	✓
Great Britain & Northern Ireland* (1984)	1996	✓	✓	Israel (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓		2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓		2007	✓	✓
Hungary (1986)	1996	✓	✓	Italy (2001-2004; re-instated in 2007)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(No)	
	2000	No			2000	(No)	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓		2003	No	
	2004	✓	✓		2004	No	
	2005	✓	✓		2005		
	2006	✓	✓		2006		
	2007	✓	✓		2007	No	
Iceland (2009)	2007	No		Japan (1991)	1996	✓	✓
					1997	✓	✓
					1998	✓	✓
					1999	✓	✓
					2000	✓	✓
					2001	✓	✓
					2002	✓	✓
					2003	✓	✓
					2004	✓	✓
					2005	✓	✓
					2006	✓	✓
					2007	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

* 1997, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007 without Northern Ireland

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2007

(based on GESIS documentation, July, 2009: Latvia to Portugal)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Latvia (1997)	1996	✓	✓	Norway (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓		2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓		2007	✓	✓
Mexico (2000)	2000	✓	✓	Philippines (1989)	1996	✓	✓
	2001	No			1997	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	2003	No			1999	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2006	No			2002	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
Netherlands (1985)	1996	No			2004	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		2006	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		2007	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓	Poland (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	2003	No*	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2005	(TP)	No		2001	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2007	No			2003	✓	✓
New Zealand (1990)	1996	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		2005	No	
	1998	✓	✓		2006	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		2007	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓	Portugal (1995)	1996	No	
	2001	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2006	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	1996	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		2006	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		2007	No	
	2000	✓	✓				
	2001	✓	✓				
	2002	✓	✓				
	2003	✓	✓				
	2004	✓	✓				
	2005	✓	✓				
	2006	✓	✓				
	2007	✓	✓				

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

* data delivery late; not integrated in common data file

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2007

(based on GESIS documentation, July, 2009: Russia to Switzerland)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Russia (1990)	1996	✓	✓	South Korea (2003)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997		
	1998	✓	✓		1998		
	1999	✓	✓		1999		
	2000	✓	✓		2000		
	2001	✓	✓		2001		
	2002	✓	✓		2002		
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓		2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓		2007	✓	✓
Slovak Republic (1996, re- instated)	1996	No		Spain (1993)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	No			2005	✓	✓
	2006	No			2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓		2007	No	
Slovenia (1992)	1996	✓	✓	Sweden (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓		2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓		2007	✓	✓
South Africa (2001, re- instated)	2001	✓	✓	Switzerland (1999)	1997	✓	✓
	2002	No			1998	✓	No
	2003	✓	✓		1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2004	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
					2004	✓	✓
					2005	✓	✓
					2006	✓	✓
					2007	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2007

(based on GESIS documentation, July, 2009: Taiwan to Venezuela)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Taiwan (2001)	2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓
Turkey (2006)	2007	No	
Ukraine (2008)	2007	No	

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Uruguay (2003)	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	No	
	2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓
USA (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓
	2006	✓	✓
	2007	✓	✓
Venezuela (1999)	1999	No	
	2000	No	
	2001	No	
	2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	No	
	2006	✓	✓
	2007	No	

Monitoring Findings Chart

2007

for

Austria (A)
Argentina (ARG)
Australia (AUS)
Bulgaria (BG)
Switzerland (CH)
Chile (CL)
Cyprus (CY)
Czech Republic (CZ)
Germany (D)
Dominican Republic (DO)
France (F)
Finland (FIN)
Flanders (FL)
Great Britain (GB)
Hungary (H)
Croatia (HR)
Israel (IL)
Ireland (IRL)
Japan (J)
Latvia (LV)
Mexico (MEX)
Norway (N)
New Zealand (NZ)
Poland (PL)
South Korea (ROK)
Uruguay (ROU)
The Philippines (RP)
Russia (RUS)
Sweden (S)
Slovak Republic (SK)
Slovenia (SLO)
Taiwan (TW)
United States of America (USA)
South Africa (ZA)

Language(s) and translation

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>												
Language 1 (L1)	German ^A	Spanish	English	Bulgarian	German	Spanish	Greek	Czech	German	Spanish	French	Finnish
Language 2 (L2)					French							Swedish
Language 3 (L3)					Italian							
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>												
Yes, translated:												
- by member(s) of research team		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
- by translation bureau												
- by specially trained translator(s)					L1-L3				X			L1, L2
- other					L1-L3 ^{CH}							
No, not translated	X		X									

^A Austria used the German translation.^{CH} Double translation.

Translation (continued)

	FL	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Croatian	Hebrew	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	English
Language 2 (L2)					Arabic			Russian			
Language 3 (L3)					Russian						
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>											
Yes, translated:											
- by member(s) of research team	X		X	X			X	L1, L2		X	
- by translation bureau	X						X				
- by specially trained translator(s)					L1-L3		X		X		
- other											
No, not translated		X				X					X

Translation (continued)

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Filipino	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English	English
Language 2 (L2)				Ilocano			Hungarian			Spanish	Afrikaans
Language 3 (L3)				Bicolano							Zulu
Language 4 (L4)				Cebuano							Tsonga
Language 5 (L5)				Ilonggo							Tswana
Language 6 (L6)											Venda
Language 7 (L7)											Xhosa
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>											
Yes, translated:											
- by member(s) of research team	X	X	X	L1		X		X	X		
- by translation bureau											
- by specially trained translator(s)	X				X		L1, L2			L2	L2-L7
- other				L2-L5 ^{RP}							
No, not translated										L1	L1

^{RP} Field Anchor whose native language is Ilocano/Bicolano/Cebuano/Ilonggo and has been doing translations even before working at Social Weather Stations

Translation (continued)

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>												
Language 1 (L1)	German ^A	Spanish	English	Bulgarian	German	Spanish	Greek	Czech	German	Spanish	French	Finnish
Language 2 (L2)					French							Swedish
Language 3 (L3)					Italian							
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>												
Yes:												
- group discussion				X	L1-L3	X	X	X	X	X		
- expert checked it				X	L1-L3				X	X	X	L1, L2
- back translation												
- other		X ^{ARG}										
No												
Not applicable	X		X									

^A Austria used the German translation.^{ARG} Co-operation with Spanish ISSP

Translation (continued)

	FL	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Croatian	Hebrew	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	English
Language 2 (L2)					Arabic			Russian			
Language 3 (L3)					Russian						
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>											
Yes:											
- group discussion			X	X	L1-L3			L1, L2		X	
- expert checked it	X						X				
- back translation				X					X		
- other											
No											
Not applicable		X				X					X

Translation (continued)

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Filipino	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English	English
Language 2 (L2)				Ilocano			Hungarian			Spanish	Afrikaans
Language 3 (L3)				Bicolano							Zulu
Language 4 (L4)				Cebuano							Tsonga
Language 5 (L5)				Ilonggo							Tswana
Language 6 (L6)											Venda
Language 7 (L7)											Xhosa
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>											
Yes:											
- group discussion	X	X	X	L1		X		X	X	L2	
- expert checked it	X				X		L1, L2		X	L2	L2-L7
- back translation											
- other				L1-L5 ^{RP}							
No											
Not applicable										L1	L1

^{RP} Discussion with field interviewers who can speak the language, i.e., those assigned to implement the questionnaire in the area where the language is spoken.

Translation (continued)

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>												
Language 1 (L1)	German ^A	Spanish	English	Bulgarian	German	Spanish	Greek	Czech	German	Spanish	French	Finnish
Language 2 (L2)					French							Swedish
Language 3 (L3)					Italian							
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>												
Yes		X			L1, L2	X	X		X	X		L1, L2
No				X	L3			X			X	
Not applicable	X		X									
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>												
Yes									X			L1, L2
No		X		X	L1-L3	X	X	X		X	X	
Not applicable	X		X									

^A Austria used the German translation.

Translation (continued)

	FL	GB	H	HR	IL	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Croatian	Hebrew	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	English
Language 2 (L2)					Arabic			Russian			
Language 3 (L3)					Russian						
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>											
Yes	X		X						X		
No				X	L1-L3		X	L1, L2		X	
Not applicable		X				X					X
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>											
Yes											
No	X		X	X	L1-L3		X	L1, L2	X	X	
Not applicable		X				X					X

Translation (continued)

	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>											
Language 1 (L1)	Polish	Korean	Spanish	Filipino	Russian	Swedish	Slovak	Slovenian	Chinese	English	English
Language 2 (L2)				Ilocano			Hungarian			Spanish	Afrikaans
Language 3 (L3)				Bicolano							Zulu
Language 4 (L4)				Cebuano							Tsonga
Language 5 (L5)				Ilonggo							Tswana
Language 6 (L6)											Venda
Language 7 (L7)											Xhosa
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>											
Yes		X		L1					X	L2	L2
No	X		X	L2-L5	X	X	L1, L2	X			L3-L7
Not applicable										L1	L1
<i>Were there any questions... which caused problems when translating?</i>											
Yes						X					
No	X	X	X	L1-L5	X		L1, L2	X	X	L2	L2-L7
Not applicable										L1	L1

Survey context

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																	
Individual survey							X			X	X	X					X
Larger survey:																	
- with ISSP at start	X		X	X	X			X							X	X	
- with ISSP in middle		X				X			X					X			
- with ISSP at end													X				

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																	
Individual survey		X		X		X						X					
Larger survey:																	
- with ISSP at start	X				X				X	X			X		X		X
- with ISSP in middle								X						X		X	
- with ISSP at end			X				X				X						

Question coverage and order

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?</i>																	
Yes		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
No	X												X				
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>																	
Yes, all included				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X
No, not all included:																	
- from module																	
- background items	X	X	X										X		X		

Question coverage and order (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?</i>																	
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No																	
<i>Were all the core ISSP items included?</i>																	
Yes, all included	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
No, not all included:																	
- from module																	
- background items															X	X	

Sampling

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																	
...only adult citizens of country	X		X			X	X	X					X				X
...adults of any nationality		X		X	X				X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>																	
... <u>private</u> accommodation only	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
... <u>private & institutional</u> accommodation			X										X				
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																	
19																	
18	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
17																	
16																	
15												X					

Sampling (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																	
...only adult citizens of country		X		X				X		X	X	X	X		X		X
...adults of any nationality	X		X		X	X	X		X					X		X	
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>																	
... <u>private</u> accommodation <u>only</u>	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
... <u>private & institutional</u> accommodation					X	X											
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																	
19					X												
18	X		X	X		X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	
17									X								
16		X									X						X
15																	

Sampling (continued)

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																	
Yes																	
Age								79				74	85				
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X
<i>Did you use any variables for stratification?</i>																	
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
No											X						
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>																	
One stage			X									X					
Two stages								X	X		X		X	X	X		
Three stages	X	X		X	X	X	X			X						X	
Four or more stages																	X

Sampling (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																	
Yes																	
Age			74		80							79					
No	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
<i>Did you use any variables for stratification?</i>																	
Yes	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
No					X			X				X					
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>																	
One stage												X					
Two stages		X			X	X							X	X			
Three stages	X		X	X			X	X							X		X
Four or more stages									X	X	X					X	

Sampling (continued)

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>																	
Addresses				X							X			X			X
Households	X				X		X	X			X				X		
Named individuals (target persons)			X						X			X	X				
Named individuals (not the target persons)																	
Areas		X								X						X	
Something else						X ^{CL}											
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																	
Kish grid	X				X	X	X	X		X				X	X		X
Birthday method		X		X							X					X	
Quota																	
Other																	
Not applicable			X						X			X	X				

^{CL} Use of census data; for urban areas: list of population by province, borough, district, zone and block;
for rural areas: list of population by province, borough, district, locality and entity.

Sampling (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>																	
Addresses	X																
Households			X					X			X						X
Named individuals (target persons)		X			X	X	X					X		X	X	X	
Named individuals (not the target persons)																	
Areas				X					X	X			X				
Something else																	
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																	
Kish grid				X						X						X	X
Birthday method	X		X					X	X		X		X				
Quota																	
Other																	
Not applicable		X			X	X	X					X		X	X		

Sampling (continued)

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																	
Yes		X ^{ARG}				X ^{CL}	X ^{CY}		X ^D								
No	X		X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																	
Yes											X ^{RUS}		X ^{SK}				
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X

^{ARG} Substitution of non contacts during weekend; substitution of refusals; substitution of sample points

^{CL} Substitution of non contacts, refusals and sampling points.

^{CY} Substitution of non contacts and refusals.

^D Substitution of sample points where the municipalities who administer the local register do not deliver information prior to the start of the fieldwork.

^{RUS} Substitution of non contacts or refusals.

^{SK} Substitution if respondent could not participate or did not want to.

Data collection

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>																	
Face-to-face	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X ^b	X			X ^b	X ^b	X	X	X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)									X ^s				X ^s	X ^s			
Self-completion by mail			X								X	X					
Telephone																	
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																	
2 weeks or less															X		
Over 2 weeks < 1 month						X		X		X							
1 month < 2 mths	X			X			X										
2 months < 3 mths												X				X	
3 mths or more		X	X		X				X		X		X	X			X
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																	
2006																X	
2007		X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X
2008	X	X		X					X								

^b background variables^s substantive variables

Data collection (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>																	
Face-to-face	X		X	X			X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)		X									X						
Self-completion by mail					X	X						X					
Telephone																	
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																	
2 weeks or less		X		X						X	X						
Over 2 weeks < 1 month			X				X						X				
1 month < 2 mths																	X
2 months < 3 mths					X	X		X				X		X	X		
3 mths or more	X								X							X	
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																	
2006														X			
2007		X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X			X		X
2008	X			X			X		X	X			X			X	

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement

	A	ARG	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>														
Yes - postal components:														
- advance letter				X			X	X		X	X			
- reminder & thank you letters														
Yes - telephone components	X			X ^{CH}					X	X				
No		X	X		X	X						X	X	X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>														
Yes:														
- to respondent				X							X	X		
- to interviewer							X		X					
No	X	X	X		X	X		X		X			X	X
<i>Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?</i>														
Yes	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No						X								

^{CH} plus conversion letter (after face-to-face and phone attempt): targeted information letter for refusals with a promised incentive of 60 CHF.

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>														
Yes - postal components:														
- advance letter		X			X						X	X	X	
- reminder & thank you letters														
Yes - telephone components						X						X	X	
No	X		X	X			X	X	X	X				X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>														
Yes:														
- to respondent	X	X				X						X	X	
- to interviewer		X				X				X	X			
No			X	X	X		X	X	X					X
<i>Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?</i>														
Yes	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
No				X									X	

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	A	ARG	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?</i>														
Call at different time of day	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
None of these														
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>														
Yes:														
Minimum number of required calls	5	3	3	5	3		3	4	4	5	4		3	4
No						X						X		
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>														
Yes:														
Approximate proportion (%)					7	20			60		2			
No	X	X	X	X			X	X		X		X	X	X

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?</i>														
Call at different time of day	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
None of these														
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>														
Yes:														
Minimum number of required calls	5	3	2	3	3	5	4	3		4	5	3	10	3
No									X					
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>														
Yes:														
Approximate proportion (%)				25		5		10				1	10	10
No	X	X	X		X		X		X	X	X			

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	A	ARG	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>														
Yes:														
Approximate proportion (%)	14	20	10	20	30	10	33	100	100	61 ^{FL}	10	10	60	30
No														

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Were any interviews back-checked?</i>														
Yes:														
Approximate proportion (%)	18		10	5	5	100	41	30	15	5	60	30	20	15
No		X												

^{FL} All respondents received a prepaid control card with some questions to validate the quality of the interview; 61 % of the respondents send the card back. 27 % of the respondents in the face-to-face interviews received a telephone call to validate the quality of the interview.

Data collection: mail

	AUS	F	FIN	N	NZ	S
<i>Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?</i>						
Yes:						
- reminders by telephone						X
No	X	X	X	X	X	
<i>What was sent out in the first mailing?</i>						
Questionnaire		X	X	X	X	
Data protection information	X	X	X	X		X
Explanatory letter	X	X	X	X	X	X
Incentive				X		
Other material						
<i>What was sent out in the second mailing?</i>						
Thank you and reminder combined		X	X	X		
Reminder sent only to non-respondents					X	
Questionnaire	X	X				X
Data protection information	X	X				X
Explanatory letter	X	X				
Incentive						X
Other material	X					

Data collection: mail (continued)

	AUS	F	FIN	N	NZ	S
<i>What was sent out in the third mailing?</i>						
Questionnaire			X	X	X	X
Data protection information			X	X		X
Explanatory letter			X	X	X	
Incentive				X		
Other material	X					
No third mailing		X				
<i>What was sent out in the fourth (or last) mailing?</i>						
Questionnaire			X	X		X
Data protection information			X	X		X
Explanatory letter			X	X		
Reminder only to non-respondents						
Incentive				X		
Other material	X					
No fourth mailing		X			X	

Information on response and outcome figures ⁺

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D ^D	DO	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																	
Issued sample (n)	1772	4871	6666	2079	2255	1680	1302	2490	3417/1531	2959	10000	2500	2340	2222	1558	3038	1834
Ineligible (n)	91	675	319	421	46	12	28	184	442/183	148	281	9	67	239		29	112
Eligible (n)	1681	4196	6347	1658	2209	1668	1274	2306	2975/1348	2811	9719	2491	2273	1984	1558	3009	1722
- refusal (n)	364	1223	848	256	712	106	67	392	1417/649	151		37	687	666	264	1445	432
- non-contact (n)	281	1187	2686	178	399	56		625	211/100	324	7558	1092	135	97	48	333	201
- other unproductive (n)	13	129	44	224	95	1	200	64	160/51	172		8	194	191	219	31	51
- completed cases (n)	1020	1657	2769	1000	1003	1505	1000	1222	1174/543	2164	2061	1354	1257	1028	1027	1200	1038
- partially completed (n)	3						7	3	13/5		100			2			

⁺ for calculation of response figures, see appendix.

^D Western federal states followed by eastern federal states.

Information on response and outcome figures (continued)⁺

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																	
Issued sample (n)	3500	1800	1960	2000	2700	2250	2495	2500	2105	2951	6835	2001	1899	1515	4912	2000	3493
Ineligible (n)	360	103	178		104	181	268	39	184		265	17	154	100	236	151	51
Eligible (n)	3140	1697	1782	2000	2596	2069	2227	2461	1921	2951	6570	1984	1745	1415	4576	1849	3442
- refusal (n)	457	228	294	217	114	60	301	553	275	245	2383	88	475	206	675	207	456
- non-contact (n)	555	37	399		1287	964	223	391	179	447	1926	482	105	33	1522	29	65
- other unproductive(n)	79	179	18	126	36	47	410	86	30	1044	219	105	27	169	332	77	14
- completed cases (n)	2049	1253	1069	1607	1143	996	1293	1431	1437	1200	2005	1309	1138	1003	2147	1536 ^{USA}	2905
- partially completed (n)			2	50	16					15	37			4			2

⁺ for calculation of response figures, see appendix.

^{USA} 285 telephone interviews included (18,6% of interviews completed)

Data

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Were any measures of coding reliability employed?</i>																	
Yes		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
No	X				X								X				
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>																	
Yes:																	
Approximate proportion (%)		20		100		100	10	100				1	100	100	10	100	15
No	X		X		X				X	X	X						
<i>Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>																	
Yes	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
No																	X
No derived variables		X															

Data (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Were any measures of coding reliability employed?</i>																	
Yes	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No		X				X											
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>																	
Yes:																	
Approximate proportion (%)	10	100		100	25			100		100	20	10			100		100
No			X			X	X		X				X	X		X	
<i>Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>																	
Yes		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X
No			X											X			
No derived variables	X										X		X				

Data (continued)

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>																	
- filters	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- logic or consistency	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>																	
Yes:																	
- individually	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
- automatically				X						X		X		X	X	X	
No																	
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>																	
Yes	X	X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X		
No			X				X		X	X						X	X

Data (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>																	
- filters	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- logic or consistency	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>																	
Yes:																	
- individually	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
- automatically		X			X	X					X	X	X	X			X
No																	
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>																	
Yes	X						X		X	X	X		X		X	X	X
No		X	X	X	X	X		X				X		X			

Documentation

	A	ARG	AUS	BG	CH	CL	CY	CZ	D	DO	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	HR	IL
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>																	
Yes	X		X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X		
No		X					X	X			X	X				X	X

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	PL	ROK	ROU	RP	RUS	S	SK	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Is a national methods report available for your study?</i>																	
Yes					X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
No	X	X	X	X		X	X										X

Appendix

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
1	Austria	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded with the ISSP 2008 module “Religion” and the Questionnaire section” dissemination and social significance of new age spirituality in Austria”.
2	Argentina	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded together with a social mobility study in split with the ISSP 2006 module “Role of Government”.
3	Australia	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded along with the AuSSA (Australian Survey of Social Attitudes) 2007.
4	Bulgaria	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2009 module “Social Inequality” and a few more questions about sport, poverty, social exclusion, social stratification and national identity.
5	Chile	The ISSP 2007 module was carried out together with questions relating to Chilean political, economic and social attitudes.
6	Croatia	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded along with the ISSP 2006 module.
7	Czech Republic	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded together with more detailed questions concerning sports, leisure time, and taste; and a few more questions about social distance and value orientations.
8	Flanders	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded together with the annual survey “Social-cultural changes in Flanders Belgium” that contained a module on lifelong learning; a module on information and communication technology; a module on politics with political efficacy scale, political participation, party preference, trust in government and institutions, image of different policy levels, contact with government, leisure time; a module on reading books; a module on privacy and survey climate; etc.
9	Germany	The ISSP 2007 was fielded in split with the ISSP 2008 together with the ALLBUS (German General Social Survey) 2008.
10	Great Britain	ISSP 2007 was fielded as part of the 25 th British Social Attitudes Survey, 2007.
11	Hungary	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded with the regular omnibus survey of TARKI.
12	Ireland	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded with the ISSP 2008 module and NORFACE “The Re-Emergence of Religion as a Social Force in Europe”
13	Latvia	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded along with the ISSP 2006 module.

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
14	Norway	Form of physical activities, social networks, children and sports, sports on TV, sports on the Internet and sports as a topic of conversation.
15	The Philippines	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded together with a survey about self-assessed English proficiency, favorite television station for sports, most admired male and female athletes, recommended sports for young Filipino boys and girls, swimming, favorite basketball teams, favorite brand of sports clothes and shoes, 2008 Olympics, promotion of sports in the Philippines, consumption of non-alcoholic drinks and personal lifestyle.
16	Poland	The ISSP 2007 was fielded together with the Polish General Social Survey 2008.
17	Russia	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded together with the regular omnibus survey.
18	Slovakia	ISSP modules 2006, 2007 and 2008 were fielded together
19	Slovenia	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded with another ISSP module and a General National Social Survey with an accent on perception of social and economic conditions, values, political attitudes etc.
20	South Africa	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded with the South African Social Attitude survey.
21	South Korea	The ISSP 2007 module and a 2007 special topical module “Arts and Culture” were fielded as part of the 2007 KGSS (Korean General Social Survey).
22	Switzerland	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2006 module. These two ISSP modules were part of a larger Swiss survey named MOSAiCH, which contains some questions about politics and demographics and a rotating module, this year, about labour.
23	Taiwan	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded together with Taiwan Social Change Survey. Other Topics are listed as followed: lifestyle, perceptions about sports and leisure activities, travel and tourism, reading habits, travel complaints and lawsuits, travel safety and personality.
24	Uruguay	The ISSP 2007 module was fielded together with the Quality of life survey (IADB Project).
25	USA	The ISSP 2007 module was asked on a version of the 2008 GSS that contained the 2007 ISSP module, some other modules, and demographics required for the ISSP.

Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures

Report Category	Face-to-Face Questionnaire Category	Mail Questionnaire Category
Issued sample (n)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)
Ineligible (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addresses which could not be traced at all/ selected respondents who could not be traced - Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addresses which could not be traced - Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings - Details of address wrong (street numbers, post codes, etc.) - Addresses with no letter boxes - Selected respondent unknown at address - Selected respondent moved, no forwarding address - Selected respondent deceased
Eligible (n)	Issued sample minus Ineligible	Issued sample minus Ineligible
Refusal (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personal refusal at selected address - Proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent) - Other refusal at selected address 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refusal by selected respondent - Refusal by another person - Implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)
Non-contact (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No contact at selected address - No contact with selected person 	No contact
Other unproductive (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate - Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey - Selected respondent away during survey period - Other type of unproductive reaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate - Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey - Selected respondent away during survey period - Other type of unproductive reaction
Completed cases (n)	Full productive interview	Completed returned questionnaires (net sample size)
Partially completed (n)	Partial productive interview	Partially completed returned questionnaires

ISSP Study Monitoring Questionnaires for Face-to-Face and Mail Surveys

***INTERNATIONAL
SOCIAL
SURVEY
PROGRAMME***

Study Monitoring Questionnaire

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
LEISURE TIME AND SPORTS 2007 ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

RETURN TO: issp@gesis.org

1a. Please enter the name of your institute and your country:

Institute:

Country:

1b. Please enter the name of the principal investigator and your contact person for questions about the study:

Principal
Investigator:

Contact
Person:

2a. What kind of institute fielded the module?

An institute principally doing market research

☐

An institute principally doing academic research

☐

An institute doing both market and academic research

☐

Other (please write in details)

☐

2b. Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member
institute itself

☐

OR

Institute
name:

3a. Was the questionnaire fielded ...

only in English

☐

→ Question 39

in English plus other language(s)

☐

→ Question 3b

only in translation

☐

→ Question 3b

3b. Please enter the language(s) the module was fielded in.

Please write in: Language 1 to Language X

4. Was the questionnaire for language 1 ...?

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 5

an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 11

5. Who carried out translation 1? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

6. Was translation 1 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 7

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 7

No ☐ → Question 8

7. How was translation 1 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

8. Was the translation 1 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

9. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 1? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 11

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

10. What did you do about any problems in translation 1?

Please enter details:

11. Was the questionnaire for language 2 ...? (answer only if you have two or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 12

an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 18

12. Who carried out translation 2? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

13. Was translation 2 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 14

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 14

No ☐ → Question 15

14. How was translation 2 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

15. Was the translation 2 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

16. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 2? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 18

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

17. What did you do about any problems in translation 2?

Please enter details:

18. Was the questionnaire for language 3 ...? (answer only if you have three or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 19

an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 25

19. Who carried out translation 3? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

20. Was translation 3 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 21

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 21

No ☐ → Question 22

21. How was translation 3 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

22. Was the translation 3 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

23. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 3? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 25

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

24. What did you do about any problems in translation 3?

Please enter details:

25. Was the questionnaire for language 4 ...? (answer only if you have four or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 26
 an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 32

26. Who carried out translation 4? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐
 A translation bureau ☐
 One or more specially trained translators ☐
 Other (please write in details) ☐

27. Was translation 4 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 28
 Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 28
 No ☐ → Question 29

28. How was translation 4 checked?

Group discussion ☐
 Expert checked it ☐
 Back translation ☐
 Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

29. Was the translation 4 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐
 No ☐

30. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 4? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 32

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

31. What did you do about any problems in translation 4?

Please enter details:

32. Was the questionnaire for language 5 ...? (answer only if you have five or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 33

an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 39

33. Who carried out translation 5? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

34. Was translation 5 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 35

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 35

No ☐ → Question 36

35. How was translation 5 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

36. Was the translation 5 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

37. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 5? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 39

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

38. What did you do about any problems in translation 5?

Please enter details:

39. What data collection methods were used for the module (substantive and background questions)?

Face-to-face ☐

Self-completion (with some interviewer involvement in delivering or collecting) ☐

'Mixed mode': part self-completion, part face-to-face (please write in details) ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

If 'mixed mode' or other, please write in:

40. Were postal or telephone components used at any point (e.g., advance contacts)?

Yes - postal ☐ → Question 41

Yes - telephone ☐ → Question 41

No ☐ → Question 42

41. Please give details of the postal and/or telephone components.

Please enter details:

42. Were incentives offered?

Yes, to respondent ☐

Yes, to interviewer ☐

No, neither to respondent nor to interviewer ☐

43. How was the ISSP module fielded in your country?

As an individual survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey) ☐ → Question 46

As part of a larger survey ☐ → Question 44

44. Please provide information about the other stud(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).

Please enter details:

45. What was the approximate position of the Leisure Time and Sports module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

46. Were the substantive questions in the Leisure Time and Sports module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes ☐ → Question 48

Yes, apart from omissions ☐ → Question 47

No ☐ → Question 47

47. Why was the question order changed?

Please enter:

48. Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire (by core we mean all required substantive and background questions)?

Yes – all Leisure Time and Sports questions and background questions included ☐ → Question 50

No – substantive question(s) from Leisure Time and Sports module missing ☐ → Question 49

No – required background ISSP question(s) missing ☐ → Question 49

49. Please provide details of the questions missing and indicate why they are missing.

ISSP source questionnaire: question number or description of question:

Reason(s) why missing:

Here we ask questions on sampling.

50. First, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adult citizens of your country? ☐

Adults of any nationality residing in your country? ☐

51. Second, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adults living in private accommodation? ☐ → Question 52

Adults living in private and in institutional accommodation
(e.g., residential homes for the elderly, asylum accommodation)? ☐

If private and institutional, please enter details in box below.

Please enter in:

52. Third, what was the lower age cut-off for your sample?

WRITE IN :

53. Was there any upper age cut-off for your sample?

Yes - please write in cut-off

No cut-off

54. Were any groups excluded or under-represented in your sample design, apart from the age cut-offs or citizenship requirements just asked about?

No

Yes (please write in details)

If yes, write in details:

55. Did you use any variables for stratification?

Yes → Question 56

No → Question 57

56. Please describe the stratification variables used?

Please write in:

57. How many of stages does your sampling design have?

One stage

Two stages

Three stages

Four stages

58. Does your sampling frame consist of...?

Addresses ☐

Households ☐

Named individuals (the target persons) ☐

Named individuals (not the target persons) ☐

Areas ☐

Something else (please write in details) ☐

59. Please describe your sampling frame (e.g., population register, electoral roll, telephone directory and its coverage and updating).

Please write in:

60. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the first stage?

Please write in:

61. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the second stage?
(only if you have two or more stages, otherwise continue with question 64)

Please write in:

62. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the third stage?
(only if you have three or more stages, otherwise continue with question 64)

Please write in:

63. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the fourth stage?

(only if you have four stages, otherwise continue with question 64)

Please write in:

64. What selection method was used to identify a respondent?

Please tick all that apply. (do not answer if your sampling frame consists of named individuals – which are the target persons. Then continue with question 66)

Kish grid ☐

Last (or next) birthday ☐

Quota ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

65. Please describe your quota procedures. **(only if you used quota, otherwise continue with question 66)**

Please write in:

66. Was substitution or replacement permitted at any stage of your selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes ☐ → Question 67

No ☐ → Question 68

67. Please provide details of the substitution or replacement procedures used.

Please write in:

68. All in all, what are the known limitations (biases) of your net sample?
For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?

Please write in:

69. Please fill in the following details about your issued sample.
Some categories may well not apply, but please complete to the highest level of detail possible.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Total number of <u>starting</u> or <u>issued</u> names/addresses (gross sample size) | <input type="text"/> |
| - addresses which could not be traced at all | <input type="text"/> |
| - selected respondents who could not be traced | <input type="text"/> |
| - addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings | <input type="text"/> |
| - selected respondent too sick/incapacitated to participate | <input type="text"/> |
| - selected respondent away during survey period | <input type="text"/> |
| - selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey | <input type="text"/> |
| - no contact at selected address | <input type="text"/> |
| - no contact with selected person | <input type="text"/> |
| - personal refusal at selected address | <input type="text"/> |
| - proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent) | <input type="text"/> |
| - other refusal at selected address | <input type="text"/> |
| - other type of unproductive reaction (please write in full details in the box below) | <input type="text"/> |
| - full productive interview (net sample size) | <input type="text"/> |
| - partial productive interview | <input type="text"/> |

More information or Other type of unproductive reaction

Please write in:

70. Here we ask for information about interviewer procedures.

a. Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?

Yes ☐

No ☐

b. Which, if any, of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address/household?

PLEASE TICK THOSE THAT APPLY

Calls/visits must be made at different times of day ☐

Calls/visits must be made on different days of week ☐

Neither of the above ☐

c. Were interviewers required to make a certain number of calls/ visits before they stopped approaching an address or household?

Minimum number of calls/visits required - please write in number

No minimum call requirement ☐

d. Were any interviews supervised (that is, supervisor accompanies interviewer)?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion %

No ☐

e. Were any interviews back-checked (e.g. supervisor checks later whether interview conducted)?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion %

No ☐

71. Please write in the approximate start and end dates of fieldwork.

D D M M Y Y

Start date

End date

72. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes ☐

No ☐

73. Was keying of the data verified?

Yes - please write in approximate level of verification %

No ☐

74. Were any reliability checks made on derived variables (that is variables constructed on the basis of other variables collected)?

Yes ☐

No ☐

No derived variables ☐

75. Were data checked/edited to ensure that filter instructions were followed correctly?

Yes ☐

No ☐

76. Were data checked/edited for logic or consistency?

Yes ☐

No ☐

77. Were data checked/edited to ensure they fell within permitted ranges?

Yes ☐

No ☐

**If you answered YES for any question from Q72 to Q77, continue with Question 78.
If you answered NO for all questions Q72 to Q77, continue with Question 79.**

78. Were errors corrected?
Please tick all that apply.

Yes - individually ☐

Yes - automatically ☐

No - not corrected ☐

79. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes ☐ → Question 80

No ☐ → Question 81

80. Please briefly describe the weighting or post-stratification strategy used.

Please write in:

81.

Yes ☐No ☐

82. If there is anything you would like to comment on, please do so here.

Please write in:

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

***INTERNATIONAL
SOCIAL
SURVEY
PROGRAMME***

Study Monitoring Questionnaire

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
LEISURE TIME AND SPORTS 2007 ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

RETURN TO: issp@gesis.org

1a. Please enter the name of your institute and your country:

Institute:

Country:

1b. Please enter the name of the principal investigator and your contact person for questions about the study:

Principal
Investigator:

Contact
Person:

2a. What kind of institute fielded the module?

An institute principally doing market research

☐

An institute principally doing academic research

☐

An institute doing both market and academic research

☐

Other (please write in details)

☐

2b. Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member
institute itself

☐

OR

Institute
name:

3a. Was the questionnaire fielded ...

only in English

☐

→ Question 34

in English plus other language(s)

☐

→ Question 3b

only in translation

☐

→ Question 3b

3b. Please enter the language(s) the module was fielded in.

Please write in: Language 1 to Language X

4. Who carried out translation 1? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

5. Was translation 1 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 6

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 6

No ☐ → Question 7

6. How was translation 1 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

7. Was the translation 1 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

8. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 1? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 10

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

9. What did you do about any problems in translation 1?

Please enter details:

10. Who carried out translation 2? Please tick all that apply.

(answer only if you have two or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

11. Was translation 2 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 12

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 12

No ☐ → Question 13

12. How was translation 2 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

13. Was the translation 2 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

14. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 2? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 16

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

15. What did you do about any problems in translation 2?

Please enter details:

16. Who carried out translation 3? Please tick all that apply.

answer only if you have three or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

17. Was translation 3 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 18

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 18

No ☐ → Question 19

18. How was translation 3 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

19. Was the translation 3 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

20. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 3? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 22

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

21. What did you do about any problems in translation 3?

Please enter details:

22. Who carried out translation 4? Please tick all that apply.

(answer only if you have four or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

23. Was translation 4 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 24

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 24

No ☐ → Question 25

24. How was translation 4 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

25. Was the translation 4 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

26. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 4? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 28

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

27. What did you do about any problems in translation 4?

Please enter details:

28. Who carried out translation 5? Please tick all that apply.

(answer only if you have five or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

29. Was translation 5 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 30

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 30

No ☐ → Question 31

30. How was translation 5 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

31. Was the translation 5 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

32. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 5? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 34

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

33. What did you do about any problems in translation 5?

Please enter details:

34. Here we ask questions on your mail survey.

- a. Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?
Please tick all that apply.

Yes - precontacts by telephone ☐

Yes - precontacts by personal visit ☐

Yes - reminders by telephone ☐

Yes - reminders by personal visit ☐

Yes - Other (please write in details) ☐

No - no telephone or personal (visit) contacts at all ☐

- b. How many mailings were sent out during fielding? Please enter number:

- c. What were the dates of mailings? (with multiple mailings, provide dates for the first three and the last)

1	d	d	m	m	y	y	y	y
2	d	d	m	m	y	y	y	y
3	d	d	m	m	y	y	y	y
4	d	d	m	m	y	y	y	y

d. What was sent out in each mailing? Please check all that apply.

1. Mailing:

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Mailing (answer only if you have two or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Thank you and reminder combined	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thank you sent only to respondents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reminder sent only to non-respondents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Mailing (answer only if you have three or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Mailing (or last, if more than four mailings) (answer only if you have three or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e. When did the fielding period finish officially?

d	d	m	m	y	y	y	y
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

35. How was the ISSP module fielded in your country?

As an individual survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey) ☐ → Question 38

As part of a larger survey ☐ → Question 36

36. Please provide information about the other stud(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).

Please enter:

37. What was the approximate position of the Leisure Time and Sports module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

38. Were the substantive questions in the Leisure Time and Sports module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes ☐ → Question 40

Yes, apart from omissions ☐ → Question 39

No ☐ → Question 39

39. Why was the question order changed?

Please enter:

40. Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire (by core we mean all required substantive and background questions)?

Yes – all Leisure Time and Sports questions and background questions included ☐ → Question 42

No – substantive question(s) from Leisure Time and Sports module missing ☐ → Question 41

No – required background ISSP question(s) missing ☐ → Question 41

41. Please provide details of the questions missing and indicate why they are missing.

ISSP source questionnaire: question number or description of question:

Reason(s) why missing:

Here we ask questions on sampling.

42. First, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adult citizens of your country? ☐

Adults of any nationality residing in your country? ☐

43. Second, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adults living in private accommodation? ☐ → Question 44

Adults living in private and in institutional accommodation
(e.g., residential homes for the elderly, asylum accommodation)? ☐

If private and institutional, please enter details in box below.

Please enter in:

44. Third, what was the lower age cut-off for your sample?

WRITE IN :

45. Was there any upper age cut-off for your sample?

Yes - please write in cut-off

No cut-off ☐

46. Were any groups excluded or under-represented in your sample design,
apart from the age cut-offs or citizenship requirements just asked
about?

No ☐

Yes (please write in details) ☐

If yes, write in details:

47. Did you use any variables for stratification?

Yes ☐ → Question 48

No ☐ → Question 49

48. Please describe the stratification variables used?

Please write in:

49. How many of stages does your sampling design have?

One stage ☐

Two stages ☐

Three stages ☐

Four stages ☐

50. Does your sampling frame consist of...?

Addresses ☐

Households ☐

Named individuals (the target persons) ☐

Named individuals (not the target persons) ☐

Areas ☐

Something else (please write in details) ☐

51. Please describe your sampling frame (e.g., population register, electoral roll, telephone directory and its coverage and updating).

Please write in:

52. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the first stage?

Please write in:

53. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the second stage?

(only if you have two or more stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

Please write in:

54. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the third stage?

(only if you have three or more stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

Please write in:

55. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the fourth stage?

(only if you have four stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

Please write in:

56. What selection method was used to identify a respondent?

Please tick all that apply. (do not answer if your sampling frame consists of named individuals – which are the target persons. Then continue with question 58)

Kish grid ☐

Last (or next) birthday ☐

Quota ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

57. Please describe your quota procedures. (only if you used quota, otherwise continue with question 58)

Please write in:

58. Was substitution or replacement permitted at any stage of your selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes ☐ → Question 59

No ☐ → Question 60

59. Please provide details of the substitution or replacement procedures used.

Please write in:

60. All in all, what are the known limitations (biases) of your net sample?
For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?

Please write in:

61. Please fill in the following details about your issued sample.

Some categories may well not apply, but please complete to the highest level of detail possible.

Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)

- addresses which could not be traced

- addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings

- details of address wrong (street numbers, post codes, etc.)

- addresses with no letter boxes

selected respondent unknown at address

- selected respondent moved, no forwarding address

- selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate

- selected respondent deceased

- selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey

- selected respondent away during survey period

- refusal by selected respondent

- refusal by another person ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- partial productive interview ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- other type of unproductive reaction (please write in full details in the box below) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- completed returned questionnaires (net sample size) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- partially completed returned questionnaires ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- no contact ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

More information or Other type of unproductive reaction

Please write in:

62. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes ☐

No ☐

63. Was keying of the data verified?

Yes - please write in approximate level of verification ☐ ☐ ☐ %

No ☐

64. Were any reliability checks made on derived variables (that is, variables constructed on the basis of other variables collected)?

Yes ☐

No ☐

No derived variables ☐

65. Were data checked/edited to ensure that filter instructions were followed correctly?

Yes ☐

No ☐

66. Were data checked/edited for logic or consistency?

Yes ☐

No ☐

67. Were data checked/edited to ensure they fell within permitted ranges?

Yes ☐

No ☐

If you answered YES for any question from Q62 to Q67, continue with Question 68.
If you answered NO for all questions Q62 to Q67, continue with Question 69.

68. Were errors corrected?
Please tick all that apply.

Yes - individually ☐

Yes - automatically ☐

No - not corrected ☐

69. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes ☐ → Question 70

No ☐ → Question 71

70. Please briefly describe the weighting or post-stratification strategy used.

Please write in:

71. Is a national methods report available for your study?

Yes ☐

No ☐

72. If there is anything you would like to comment on, please do so here.

Please write in:

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

THANK YOU VERY MUCH